arXiv:1211.0046v1 [math.PR] 31 Oct 2012

SPATIAL ROUGH PATH LIFTS OF STOCHASTIC CONVOLUTIONS

PETER K. FRIZ, BENJAMIN GESS, ARCHIL GULISASHVILI, AND SEBASTIAN RIEDEL

Abstract. We present sufficient conditions for finite controlled ρ-variation of the covariance of Gaussian processes with stationary increments, based on concavity or convexity of their variance function. The motivation for this type of conditions comes from recent work of Hairer [Hai11]. Our results allow to construct rough paths lifts of solutions to a class of fractional stochastic heat equations with additive, possibly colored Wiener noise with respect to their space variable.

1. Introduction

The lack of spatial regularity of solutions to PDEs subjected to space-time white noise (or other infinite-dimensional noise) can cause serious obstacles concerning well-posedness and stability. In recent work Hairer and coauthors [Hai11, HW11, Hai12, HMW12] realized that several interesting, at first sight ill-posed, non-linear stochastic PDEs can be solved by constructing a spatial rough path associated to the linearized equation. This program was carried out for a system of stochastic Burgers' equations (with motivation from path sampling problems) and more recently for the KPZ equation on the one-dimensional torus. In both cases, the linearized equation is the classical one-dimensional stochastic heat equation

$$d\Psi_t = (\Delta - 1)\,\Psi_t dt + dW_t, \quad \text{on } [0, 2\pi], \tag{SHE}$$

with periodic boundary conditions. Here Δ is the one-dimensional Laplacian, i.e. $\Delta = \partial_x^2$, the summand -1 allows to consider the corresponding stationary solution and W is space-time white noise integrated in time. We shall follow Hairer's setup and consider d i.i.d. realizations of (SHE). The question then arises how to construct a *spatial* rough path over $x \mapsto \Psi(t, x; \omega)$ for fixed time t. If such a rough path lift has been constructed one can view (SHE) as an evolution in a rough path space, a point of view which has proven extremely fruitful in solving new classes of until now ill-posed stochastic PDEs. In [Hai11] Hairer succeeded in establishing finite 1-variation (in 2D) sense of the covariance of the stationary solution to (SHE), i.e. of $(x, y) \mapsto \mathbb{E}\Psi(t, x)\,\Psi(t, y)$. According to (Gaussian) rough path theory in the form of [FV10a, FV10b] this gives a "canonical" way of lifting Ψ to a rough path $\mathbf{\Psi}$. The rough path $\mathbf{\Psi}$ is a "level 2" rough path or more precisely: $\mathbf{\Psi}$ is a $1/p$-Hölder geometric rough path for any $p > 2$ as function of x, with local regularity properties akin to standard Brownian motion as function of t.

Date: November 2, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60G15, 60H15; Secondary: 42A32.

Key words and phrases. fractional heat equation, rough paths, Gaussian processes, Fourier analysis, SPDE.

Acknowledgements: B.G. and P.K.F. have received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement nr. 258237. S.R. is supported by a scholarship from the Berlin Mathematical School (BMS). B.G., P.K.F. and S.R. would like to thank the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach where this work was first presented in August 2012 as part of the workshop "Rough paths and PDEs".

It is clear that the Brownian-like regularity of $x \mapsto \Psi(t,x;\omega)$ is due to the competition between the smoothing effects of the Laplacian and the roughness of space-time white noise. Truncation of the higher noise modes (or suitable "coloring") leads to better spatial regularity; on the other hand, replacing Δ by a fractional Laplacian, i.e. considering

$$\text{(fSHE)} \qquad d\Psi_t = \left(-\left(-\Delta\right)^{\alpha} - 1\right)\Psi_t dt + dW_t, \quad \text{on } [0,2\pi],$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ dampens the smoothing effect and $x \mapsto \Psi(t,x;\omega)$ will have "rougher" regularity properties than a standard Brownian motion. One thus expects ρ-variation regularity for the spatial covariance of $x \mapsto \Psi(t,x;\omega)$ only for some $\rho > 1$ and subsequently only the existence of a "rougher" rough path, i.e. necessarily with higher p than before. Applied in the present context, our main insights/results are as follows:

- The local covariance/decorrelation structure of the stationary fractional stochastic heat equation (fSHE) (in x) is akin to the same structure for fractional Brownian motion (in t). In quantitative terms,

  $$\text{fBM with Hurst parameter } H \;\leftrightarrow\; \text{fSHE with } \alpha = \frac{1}{2} + H.$$

  As a consequence one has finite 2D-ρ-variation of the covariance[1] with

  $$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \frac{1}{2H} \text{ for fBM with } H \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \rho &= \frac{1}{2\alpha - 1} \text{ for fSHE with } \alpha \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

- Recalling criticality of $\rho^* = 2$ we are able to lift the stationary solution to (fSHE) in the spatial variable to a rough path provided

  $$\alpha > \alpha^* = \frac{3}{4},$$

  similar to the well-known condition $H > H^* = \frac{1}{4}$ for fBM (cf. [CQ02]). More precisely, the resulting (geometric rough) path enjoys $\frac{1}{p}$-Hölder regularity for any $p > 2\rho = \frac{2}{2\alpha - 1}$. When $\alpha > \frac{5}{6}$ we have $\rho = \frac{1}{2\alpha-1} < \frac{3}{2}$ and can pick $p < 3$. The resulting rough path can then be realized as a "level 2" rough path. In the general case (similar to $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}]$ in the fBM setting) one must go beyond the stochastic area and control the third level iterated integrals. We emphasize that the notoriously difficult third-level computation need not be repeated in the present context. Everything is obtained as application of available general theory, once finite ρ-variation of the covariance is established. A satisfactory approximation theory is also available, based on *uniform* ρ-variation estimates.
- On a more technical level, we give a novel criterion to control the 2D-variation of the covariance of (not-necessarily Gaussian) processes with stationary increments and variance satisfying a decay condition at 0 and a concavity property; this translates into the required local covariance/decorrelation structure which we discussed in the first point above. Checking this criterion for fBM is essentially trivial. For fSHE this involves a fair amount of Fourier analysis, as does the quest for uniform 2D-ρ-variation estimates, e.g. in the case of smoothing fSHE with hyper-viscosity. Among others, we are then led to consider convexity, Hölder regularity and L^1-estimates for Fourier series.

---

[1] The result for fBM is of course known (cf. [FV11] and the references therein).

We believe that following a similar route to that in [Hai12][2] our techniques may prove useful in solving the fractional KPZ equation

$$dX_t = -(-\Delta)^\alpha X_t dt + (\nabla X_t)^2 dt + dW_t, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R},$$

with $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Such fractional KPZ equations arise as models of growing surfaces with impurities (cf. [MW97, XTHX12, Kat03]).

Another motivation are path sampling problems for diffusions driven by fractional noise. Recall that the original motivation for studying vector-valued stochastic Burgers' equations emerged in path sampling problems for SDE of the form

$$dZ_u = AZ_u du + f(Z_u)du + CdB_u, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.1}$$

on $[0,2\pi]$. Here $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a possibly non-linear function and B denotes standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$. In a series of papers [HSVW05, HSV07, Hai11] the authors realized that the law $\mathcal{L}(Z)$ on $C([0,2\pi];\mathbb{R}^d)$ conditioned on the endpoints coincides with the invariant measure of vector-valued stochastic Burgers' equations of the type

$$dX_t^i = \Delta X_t^i + \sum_{j=1}^n g_j^i(X_t)\partial_x X_t^j dt + dW_t^i, \quad i = 1, ..., d, \tag{1.2}$$

with appropriate boundary conditions. Based on this, efficient sampling algorithms for the paths of Z conditioned on the endpoints may be derived. It is tempting to try a similar approach in the fractional case; that is, to sample the law of (1.1) with B replaced by fractional Brownian motion B^H conditional on its endpoints, via the stationary solution of a suitable fractional SPDE. However, combining the heuristics found in [HSV07], notably the relation to Onsager-Machlup functionals, and the known form of these functionals in the fractional case [MN02], suggests an SPDE of the form (fSHE) with appropriate boundary conditions and with an additional non-local, nonlinear term. At present, handling the resulting SPDE is an open problem, although one suspects that the present considerations will prove useful in this regard.

As this work was nearing completion we learned that Gubinelli and coauthors [GIP12] adapted Hairer's analysis of the stochastic Burgers' equation to the fractional case (i.e. (1.2) with Δ replaced by $-(-\Delta)^\alpha$ for $\alpha > \frac{5}{6}$) and established existence and uniqueness of solutions. In doing so they construct a rough path associated to fSHE by direct calculations under the stronger condition $\alpha > \frac{5}{6}$. In contrast, our construction of the associated rough path is based on general Gaussian rough path theory and thus allows immediate application of the corresponding general results, such as stability under approximations and moment estimates. Without further effort we deduce estimates on the rate of convergence of approximations following from general Gaussian rough path techniques. On the other hand, a very important contribution of [GIP12] is the possibility of going beyond space dimension one which is not at all within the scope of our considerations here.

The article is structured as follows: In Section 2 we establish a general condition proving finite ρ-variation for processes with stationary increments and convex or concave variance function. We then use this condition to prove the existence of rough path lifts for such processes. The application of this general result to stationary solutions of fractional stochastic heat equations thus requires proof of concavity of their (spatial) variance function. Sufficient conditions for the concavity of such variance functions in terms of their Fourier coefficients are derived in Section 3 and used in Section

---

[2] Let us note that Hairer considers the KPZ equation on the torus while most literature is on the whole real line. In the end of Section 4 we demonstrate that our results may be used to construct local spatial rough path lifts of solutions to (fSHE) on the real line.

4 to lift strictly stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes corresponding to fractional stochastic heat equations to Gaussian rough paths with respect to their space variable. Moreover, we prove strong convergence in rough path metric of hyper-viscosity and Galerkin approximations. Section 4 is then concluded by a brief investigation of the stochastic fractional heat equation on the whole real line.

The most important notions from the theory of rough paths that will be used here are recalled in a concise manner in Appendix A.

2. Main Result

In this section, we shall consider centered, continuous stochastic processes with IID components $X = \left(X^1, \dots, X^d\right)$ and *stationary increments*. If X is Gaussian, the construction of a (geometric) rough path associated to X then naturally passes through an understanding of the two-dimensional ρ-variation of the covariance of X^1. For brevity, we abuse notation and write $X \equiv X^1$ until further notice. The law of such a process is fully determined by

$$\sigma^2(u) := \mathbb{E}X_{t,t+u}^2 = R_X\begin{pmatrix} t, t+u \\ t, t+u \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 1. (1) *Assume that $\sigma^2(\cdot)$ is concave on $[0,h]$ for some $h>0$. Then, non-overlapping increments are non-positively correlated in the sense that*

$$\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = R_X\begin{pmatrix} s,t \\ u,v \end{pmatrix} \leq 0,$$

for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq u \leq v \leq h$.

(2) *Assume in addition that $\sigma^2(\cdot)$ restricted to $[0,h]$ is non-decreasing. Then,*

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = \left|\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v}\right| \leq \mathbb{E}X_{u,v}^2 = \sigma^2(v-u),$$

for all $0 \leq s \leq u \leq v \leq t \leq h$.

Proof. (1): This result can be found in [MR06, Lemma 7.2.7]. It just follows from the identity

$$2\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = \sigma^2(v-s) + \sigma^2(u-t) - \sigma^2(v-t) - \sigma^2(u-s)$$

and the concavity of the function σ^2.

(2): Note $X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = (a+b+c)\,b$ where $a = X_{s,u}$, $b = X_{u,v}$, $c = X_{v,t}$. Applying the algebraic identity

$$2(a+b+c)\,b = (a+b)^2 - a^2 + (c+b)^2 - c^2$$

and taking expectations yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} &= \mathbb{E}X_{s,v}^2 - \mathbb{E}X_{s,u}^2 + X_{u,t}^2 - \mathbb{E}X_{v,t}^2 \\ &= \big(\sigma^2(v-s) - \sigma^2(u-s)\big) + \big(\sigma^2(v-s) - \sigma^2(u-s)\big) \\ &\geq 0 + 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sigma^2(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing. We thus see

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = \left|\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v}\right|.$$

On the other hand, from $(a+b+c)\,b = b^2 + ab + cb$, and then non-positive correlation of the non-overlapping increments,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} = \mathbb{E}X_{u,v}^2 + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}X_{s,u}X_{u,v} + \mathbb{E}X_{v,t}X_{u,v}}_{\leq 0} \leq \mathbb{E}X_{u,v}^2.$$

This concludes the proof of part (2) of Lemma 1. □

Theorem 1. *Let X be a real-valued stochastic process on $[0,T]$ with stationary increments and covariance function $\sigma^2(u) := \mathbb{E}(X_u - X_0)^2$. Assume that $\sigma^2 \colon [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is concave and that $|\sigma^2(u)| \le C_\sigma |u|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$ for all $u \in [0,T]$. Assume further that for some $h > 0$, $\sigma^2_{|[0,h]}$ is non-decreasing. Then the covariance of X is of finite ρ-variation on every rectangle $[s,t] \times [u,v] \subseteq [0,T]^2$.*

More precisely, if the interior of $[s,t] \times [u,v]$ does not intersect with the diagonal $D = \{(x,x) : x \in [0,T]\}$, then

$$V_\rho(R_X; [s,t] \times [u,v])^\rho \le C_\sigma^\rho \sqrt{|t-s|}\sqrt{|v-u|}. \tag{2.1}$$

If $[s,t] \times [u,v]$ is contained in the strip $S_h = \big\{(x,y) \in [0,1]^2 : |x-y| \le h\big\}$, then

$$V_\rho(R_X; [s,t] \times [u,v])^\rho \le C(|t-s| \wedge |v-u|) \tag{2.2}$$

holds for some constant $C = C(\rho, C_\sigma) > 0$.

In particular, there is a constant $C_1 = C_1(\rho, C_\sigma, h)$ such that

$$V_\rho(R_X; [s,t]^2)^\rho \le C_1 |t-s|$$

holds for all $[s,t]^2 \subseteq [0,T]^2$ and the covariance of X has finite Hölder-controlled ρ'-variation for all $\rho' > \rho$ on $[0,T]$.

Proof. We start by proving (2.1): Take a rectangle $[s,t] \times [u,v] \subseteq [0,T]^2$ and let (t_i) be any dissection of $[u,v]$ and (t'_j) any dissection of $[s,t]$. Assume first that $[s,t] \times [u,v]$ does not intersect with D. We have, using that concavity of σ^2 implies negative correlations along disjoint increments (cf. Lemma 1) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t_i, t'_j} \left| R_X \begin{pmatrix} t_i, t_{i+1} \\ t'_j, t'_{j+1} \end{pmatrix} \right|^\rho &= \sum_{t_i, t'_j} \left| \mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t'_j, t'_{j+1}} \right|^\rho \le \left| \sum_{t_i, t'_j} \mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t'_j, t'_{j+1}} \right|^\rho \\ &\le |\mathbb{E} X_{s,t} X_{u,v}|^\rho \le \sigma^2(t-s)^{\rho/2} \sigma^2(v-u)^{\rho/2} \le C_\sigma^\rho \sqrt{|t-s|}\sqrt{|v-u|}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all partitions shows (2.1).

Let us now prove (2.2): Let $[s,t] \times [u,v] \subseteq S_h$ and assume that $|v-u| \le |t-s| \le h$. The proof relies on separating diagonal and off-diagonal rectangles. We will distinguish 5 cases: **case 1:** $u \le v \le s \le t$, **case 2:** $u \le s \le v \le t$, **case 3:** $s \le u \le v \le t$, **case 4:** $s \le u \le t \le v$ and **case 5:** $s \le t \le u \le v$. We will only prove the cases 1 to 3, case 4 is similar to case 2 and case 5 is similar to case 1.

Case 1: For any $t_i < t_{i+1} \in [u,v]$ we have, using again Lemma 1,

$$\sum_{t'_j} \left| \mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t'_j, t'_{j+1}}] \right|^\rho \le |\mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{s,t}|^\rho$$

and

$$|\mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{s,t}| \le |\mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t_i, s}| + |\mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t_i, t}| \le 2\sigma^2(t_{i+1} - t_i).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{t_i, t'_j} \left| \mathbb{E} X_{t_i, t_{i+1}} X_{t'_j, t'_{j+1}} \right|^\rho \le 2^\rho \sum_{t_i} \sigma^2(t_{i+1} - t_i)^\rho \le 2^\rho C_\sigma^\rho \sum_{t_i} |t_{i+1} - t_i| \le 2^\rho C_\sigma^\rho |v-u|$$

and passing to the supremum gives

$$V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,v])^\rho \le C_1|v-u|$$

where $C_1 = 2^\rho C_\sigma^\rho$.

Case 3: For $t_i < t_{i+1} \in [u,v]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}3^{1-\rho}\sum_{t_j'}\left|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_{t_j',t_{j+1}'}\right|^\rho \le 3^{1-\rho}|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|^\rho_{\rho-var;[s,t]} &\le |\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|^\rho_{\rho-var;[s,t_i]}\\ &\quad+|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|^\rho_{\rho-var;[t_i,t_{i+1}]}\\ &\quad+|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|^\rho_{\rho-var;[t_{i+1},t]}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

As in case 1, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|_{\rho-var;[s,t_i]} &\le |\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_{s,t_i}|\\ &\le |\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_{s,t_{i+1}}|+|\mathbb{E}X^2_{t_i,t_{i+1}}|\\ &\le 2\sigma^2(t_{i+1}-t_i).\end{aligned}$$

The third term is bounded analogously. For the middle term in (2.3) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_\cdot|^\rho_{\rho-var;[t_i,t_{i+1}]} &= \sup_{\mathcal{D}'\subset[t_i,t_{i+1}]}\sum_{t_j'\in\mathcal{D}'}|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_{t_j',t_{j+1}'}|^\rho\\ &\le \sup_{\mathcal{D}'\subset[t_i,t_{i+1}]}\sum_{t_j'\in\mathcal{D}'}\sigma^2(t_{j+1}'-t_j')^\rho\\ &\le C_\sigma^\rho|t_{i+1}-t_i|.\end{aligned}$$

Using these estimates in (2.3) yields

$$\sum_{t_j}|\mathbb{E}X_{t_i,t_{i+1}}X_{t_j',t_{j+1}'}|^\rho \le C_3|t_{i+1}-t_i|$$

for some constant C_3 and we conclude as in case 1.

Case 2: We use the estimates from the cases 1 and 3 to see that

$$\begin{aligned}2^{1-\rho}V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,v])^\rho &\le V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,s])^\rho + V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]\times[s,v])^\rho\\ &\le C_1|s-u|+C_3|v-s|\\ &\le (C_1\vee C_3)|v-u|.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (2.2)

If $[s,t]\times[u,v]$ is any rectangle contained in $[0,T]^2$, it can be represented as a finite union of rectangles $\{A_1,\dots,A_n\}$ which are contained in S_h or lie off-diagonal. From the inequality

$$V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,v]) \le C(\rho,n)\sum_{k=1}^n V_\rho(R_X;A_k)$$

it follows that indeed the ρ-variation is is finite over all rectangles.

From equation (2.2), we know that

$$V_\rho(R_X;[s,t]^2)^\rho \le C|t-s|$$

holds for all $[s,t]^2$ provided that $|t-s| \leq h$. Using (2.1) and choosing a larger constant C, we may conclude that the estimate holds for all squares $[s,t]^2 \subseteq [0,T]^2$. With [FV11, Theorem 1] this implies the claimed finite Hölder-controlled ρ'-variation for all $\rho' > \rho$.

□

In the sense of the following remark, the assumption of σ^2 to be non-decreasing on $[0,h]$ in Theorem 1 is superfluous. We have required it only in order to get a control on the ρ-variation on the complete interval $[0,h]$.

Remark 1. *Let $\sigma^2 : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a continuous, concave function with $\sigma^2(0) = 0$ for some $T > 0$. Then there is an $h \in (0,T]$ such that σ^2 is non-decreasing on $[0,h]$.*

Proof. Since $\sigma^2 : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a continuous, concave function, each local maximum is a global maximum. Let $h := \inf\left\{t \in [0,T] \middle|\ \sigma^2(t) = \max_{r\in[0,T]} \sigma^2(r)\right\}$. Without loss of generality we may assume $\sigma^2 \not\equiv 0$. Thus, $h > 0$ and σ^2 is non-decreasing on $[0,h]$, since otherwise σ^2 would have a local maximum in $[0,h)$, thus attaining $\max_{r\in[0,T]} \sigma^2(r)$ in $[0,h)$ in contradiction to the definition of h. □

A continuous, centered Gaussian process satisfying the assumptions from Theorem 1 with $\rho \in [1,2)$ can be lifted to a geometric p-rough path on the interval $[0,T]$ (cf. [FV10a, Theorem 35], [FV10b, Theorem 15.33]). Thus, we obtain

Corollary 1. *Let $X = (X^1, ..., X^d)\colon [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a centered continuous stochastic process with independent components such that each X^i has stationary increments with covariance function $\sigma^{2,i}(u) := \mathbb{E}(X^i_u - X^i_0)^2$. Assume that for all $i = 1, \ldots, d$, $\sigma^{2,i}\colon [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is concave, $|\sigma^{2,i}(u)| \leq C_\sigma |u|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$ for all $u \in [0,T]$ and some $\rho \geq 1$ and that there is an $h > 0$ such that $\sigma^2_{|[0,h]}$ is non-decreasing. Then the covariance function $R\colon [0,T]^2 \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ has finite ρ-variation and finite Hölder-controlled ρ'-variation for every $\rho' > \rho$. In particular, if X is Gaussian and $\rho < 2$, there exists a continuous $G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d)$-valued process $\boldsymbol{X}$ such that*

1. *$\boldsymbol{X}$ is a geometric p-rough path with $\boldsymbol{X} \in C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}lder}([0,T], G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ almost surely for every $p > 2\rho$,*
2. *$\boldsymbol{X}$ lifts X in the sense that $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}_t) = X_t - X_0$,*
3. *There is a $C = C(\rho, C_\sigma, h)$ such that for all $s < t$ in $[0,T]$ and $q \in [1,\infty)$,*
$$|d(\boldsymbol{X}_s, \boldsymbol{X}_t)|_{L^q} \leq C\sqrt{q}|t-s|^{\frac{1}{2\rho}}$$
4. *(Fernique-estimates) for all $p > 2\rho$ there exists $\eta = \eta(p,\rho,h) > 0$, such that*
$$\mathbb{E}e^{\eta\|\boldsymbol{X}\|^2_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}} < \infty.$$

Remark 2. *At this point, one might ask what can be said in the case where $\sigma^2(u) = \mathbb{E}(X_u - X_0)^2$ is convex on the interval $[0,h]$. Proceeding as in Lemma 1 (i), it can be shown that non-overlapping increments are non-negatively correlated in this case. By writing large increments $X_{s,t}$ as a sum of smaller increments $X_{s,t} = X_{s,u_1} + X_{u_1,u_2} + X_{u_2,t}$, $s \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq t$, it then follows that*

$$R_X \begin{pmatrix} s,t \\ u,v \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v} \geq 0,$$

for every rectangle $[s,t] \times [u,v] \subseteq [0,h]^2$. In other words, every rectangular increment of R_X is positive. This readily implies finite 1-variation over every rectangle $[s,t] \times [u,v] \subseteq [0,h]^2$. More *precisely, we have the estimate*

$$V_1(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,v]) \le |\mathbb{E}X_{s,t}X_{u,v}|.$$

Furthermore, by convexity, $0 \le \sigma^2(u) \le u\sigma^2(1)$ *for* $u \in [0,1]$ *we deduce*

$$V_1(R_X;[s,t]\times[u,v]) \lesssim \sqrt{|t-s|}\sqrt{|v-u|},$$

for all $[s,t]^2 \subseteq [0,h]^2$.

The same is of course true for multidimensional processes $X = (X^1,\dots,X^d)$ *under the condition that every* $\sigma^{2;i}(u) = \mathbb{E}(X^i_u - X^i_0)^2$ *is convex on* $[0,h]$. *if* X *is Gaussian, this implies that we can lift* X *to a process with sample paths in the rough paths space* $C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-Hölder}([0,h],G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *for every* $p > 2$. *Moreover, the concatenation of geometric rough paths over adjacent intervals is again a rough path (cf.* [CLL11], *Lemma 4.9) and hence we can lift the sample paths of Gaussian processes* $X\colon [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ *to Gaussian rough paths on the whole interval* $[0,T]$ *provided there is a (possibly small)* $h > 0$ *such that every* $\sigma^{2;i}$ *is convex on* $[0,h]$.

For instance, this applies to fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \ge 1/2$. *However, from a rough paths point of view, these cases are merely trivial since we can use Itō calculus or Young's integration theory to define iterated integrals.*

3. Conditions in terms of Fourier coefficients

The application of Theorem 1 to stationary solutions $\Psi(x)$ to the stochastic fractional heat equation (fSHE), as functions of their spatial variable, leads to continuous, stationary, centered Gaussian processes $\Psi : [0,2\pi] \to \mathbb{R}$ with Fourier decomposition

$$\Psi(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} Z^k e^{ikx},$$

where Z^k are complex Gaussian random variables[3] with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}Z^k\bar{Z}^l = \delta_{k,l}\frac{a_k}{2}$$

and real valued coefficients a_k satisfying $a_k = a_{-k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the covariance R is of the form

$$R_K(x,y) = \mathbb{E}\Psi(x)\Psi(y) = \mathbb{E}\Psi(x)\overline{\Psi(y)} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k e^{ik(x-y)}, \quad \forall x,y \in [0,2\pi].$$

Therefore,

$$R_K(x,y) = K(|x-y|) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \cos(k|x-y|), \tag{3.1}$$

for some $K \in C([0,2\pi])$.

In the following let Δ, Δ^2 be the first and second forward-difference operators, i.e. for a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$

$$\Delta a_k := a_{k+1} - a_k$$

---

[3] Actually, the Gaussian structure plays no role in this section. Our entire analysis applies whenever the covariance function has the form (3.1).

and $\Delta^2 := \Delta \circ \Delta$. Moreover, let

$$D_n(x) := \sum_{k=-n}^{n} e^{ikx} = 1 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{n} \cos(kx), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

be the Dirichlet kernel and

$$F_n(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} D_k(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

be the unnormalized Fejér kernel.

Lemma 2. *Let* $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be such that* $\Delta^2(k^2 a_k) \le 0,\ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$ *and*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} k^3|\Delta^2 a_k| + k^2|\Delta a_k| + k|a_k| = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Then

$$K(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \cos(kx)$$

exists locally uniformly in $(0, 2\pi)$*, is convex on* $[0, 2\pi]$ *and decreasing on* $[0, \pi]$.

Proof. We first note that since

$$\Delta(k^2 a_k) = k^2\Delta a_k + (2k+1)a_{k+1}$$

and

$$\Delta^2(k^2 a_k) = k^2\Delta^2 a_k + 2(2k+1)\Delta a_{k+1} + 2a_{k+2}$$

assumption (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} |k\Delta^2(k^2 a_k)| + |\Delta(k^2 a_k)| + k|a_k| = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

We now follow ideas from [Kra11]. Using the Abel transformation we observe

$$S_n(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \cos(kx) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{n} \Delta a_{k+1} D_k(x) + \frac{1}{2} a_{n+1} D_n(x).$$

By the assumptions and (3.3) we have $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\Delta a_k| < \infty$. Since $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} D_n(x)$ is bounded locally uniformly on $(0, 2\pi)$ and $a_n \to 0$ we observe that

$$K(x) := \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \cos(kx) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta a_k D_k(x)$$

exists locally uniformly and is continuous in $(0, 2\pi)$.

The Cesàro means of the sequence $S_n(x)$ are given by

$$\sigma_n(x) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) a_k \cos(kx).$$

By Fejér's Theorem [Zyg59, Theorem III.3.4] and continuity of K, $\sigma_n \to K$ locally uniformly in $(0, 2\pi)$. Hence, $\sigma_n'' \to K''$ in the space of distributions on $(0, 2\pi)$. Clearly,

$$\sigma_n''(x) = -\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) k^2 a_k \cos(kx).$$

Let $\beta_k := \left(1 - \frac{k}{n+1}\right) k^2 a_k$. Using summation by parts twice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
2\sigma_n''(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \Delta\beta_k D_k(x) \\
&= \Delta\beta_n F_n(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Delta^2\beta_k F_k(x) \\
&= -\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Delta^2(k^2 a_k) F_k(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{k\Delta^2(k^2 a_k)}{n+1} - \frac{2\Delta\left((k+1)^2 a_{k+1}\right)}{n+1} \right) F_k(x) + \frac{n^2}{n+1} a_n F_n(x).
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.3) and $0 \le F_n(x) \le \frac{C}{x^2} + \frac{C}{(2\pi - x)^2}$ it follows

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \inf_{x\in[\varepsilon, 2\pi-\varepsilon]} \sigma_n''(x) \ge 0,$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. For any non-negative test-function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(0, 2\pi)$ Fatou's Lemma implies

$$K''(\varphi) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma_n''(\varphi) \ge \int_0^{2\pi} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sigma_n''(x)\varphi(x)dx \ge 0,$$

i.e. K'' is a non-negative distribution on $(0, 2\pi)$. Thus, K is convex on $[0, 2\pi]$. Assume now that K is not decreasing on $[0, \pi]$, i.e. there are $x < y \in [0, \pi]$ such that $K(x) < K(y)$. Since K is given as a cosine series, we have $K(x) = K(x')$ and $K(y) = K(y')$ for $x' = 2\pi - x$ and $y' = 2\pi - y$. Choose $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $tx + (1-t)x' = y$. Then

$$K(tx + (1-t)x') = K(y) > K(x) = tK(x) + (1-t)K(x'),$$

which is in contradiction to the convexity of K. □

So far we need to require concavity of the Fourier coefficients $k^2 a_k$ in order to control the 2D-ρ variation of the corresponding covariance function R_K. Smoothing R_K should preserve the control of its 2D-ρ variation, while it does not have to preserve concavity of the Fourier coefficients. The following proposition shows that finiteness of the 2D-ρ variation is indeed preserved under convolution with a measure of finite total variation and that it can be bounded by the total variation norm of this measure (cf. also [FV10b, Proposition 5.64]).

In the following let $\mathcal{M}([0, 2\pi])$ be the space of signed, real Borel-measures on $[0, 2\pi]$ with finite total variation $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$. We say that a sequence $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}([0, 2\pi])$ weakly converges to $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 2\pi])$ if

$$\mu_n(\varphi) := \int_0^{2\pi} \varphi(x) d\mu_n(x) \to \mu(\varphi) = \int_0^{2\pi} \varphi(x) d\mu(x), \quad \text{for } n \to \infty,$$

for all 2π-periodic Lipschitz functions $\varphi \in \mathrm{Lip}([0, 2\pi])$. Define $\mathcal{M}^w([0, 2\pi])$ to be $\mathcal{M}([0, 2\pi])$ endowed with the topology of weak convergence. For $B \in L^1([0, 2\pi])$ we set $\mu_B := B\,dx \in \mathcal{M}([0, 2\pi])$ to be the associated measure with density B.

Proposition 1. *Assume that the covariance of Ψ is of the form*

$$R(x, y) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k b_k e^{ik(x-y)} \tag{3.4}$$

with $a_k = a_{-k}$, $b_k = b_{-k}$ real-valued for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and there is a real-valued measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0,2\pi])$ such that

$$b_k = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ikz}\,\mu(dz).$$

Moreover, assume that $R_K(x,y) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k e^{ik(x-y)}$ is of finite ρ-variation on $[0,2\pi]^2$ and $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |a_k| < \infty$. Then R is of finite ρ-variation with

$$\begin{aligned} V_\rho(R;[s,t]\times[u,v]) &\le \|\mu\|_{TV} \sup_{0\le z\le 2\pi} V_\rho(R_K;[s-z,t-z]\times[u,v]) \\ &\le 2\|\mu\|_{TV} V_\rho(R_K;[0,2\pi]^2) \end{aligned}$$

for every $[s,t]\times[u,v] \subseteq [0,2\pi]^2$. Both estimates also hold for controlled *ρ-variation.*

Proof. Since $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |a_k| < \infty$ we observe

$$R(x,y) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k b_k e^{ik(x-y)} = (R_K(\cdot,y) * \mu)(x) = \int_0^{2\pi} R_K(x-z,y)\,d\mu(z)$$

Thus, using Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| R\begin{pmatrix} x,y \\ x',y' \end{pmatrix} \right|^\rho &\le \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \left| R_K \begin{pmatrix} x-z, y-z \\ x',y' \end{pmatrix} \right| d|\mu|(z) \right)^\rho \\ &\le \|\mu\|_{TV}^\rho \int_0^{2\pi} \left| R_K \begin{pmatrix} x-z, y-z \\ x',y' \end{pmatrix} \right|^\rho d\frac{|\mu|(z)}{\|\mu\|_{TV}}. \end{aligned}$$

We will first show the estimate for the controlled ρ-variation. Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}([s,t]\times[u,v])$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{[x,y]\times[x',y']\in\Pi} \left| R\begin{pmatrix} x,y \\ x',y' \end{pmatrix} \right|^\rho &\le \|\mu\|_{TV}^\rho \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_{[x,y]\times[x',y']\in\Pi} \left| R_K \begin{pmatrix} x-z, y-z \\ x',y' \end{pmatrix} \right|^\rho d\frac{|\mu|(z)}{\|\mu\|_{TV}} \\ &\le \|\mu\|_{TV}^\rho \int_0^{2\pi} |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[s-z,t-z]\times[u,v]} d\frac{|\mu|(z)}{\|\mu\|_{TV}} \\ &\le \|\mu\|_{TV}^\rho \sup_{0\le z\le 2\pi} |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[s-z,t-z]\times[u,v]}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all partitions yields the first inequality. For the second inequality, we use periodicity to see that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[s-z,t-z]\times[u,v]} &\le |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[-2\pi,2\pi]\times[0,2\pi]} \\ &\le 2^{\rho-1}\left(|R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[-2\pi,0]\times[0,2\pi]} + |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[0,2\pi]^2} \right) \\ &\le 2^\rho |R_K|^\rho_{\rho-\mathrm{var};[0,2\pi]^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate for the usual ρ-variation follows exactly in the same way by considering only grid-like partitions of $[s,t]\times[u,v]$, i.e. partitions of the form

$$\left\{ [t_i,t_{i+1}]\times[t'_j,t'_{j+1}] \mid (t_i) \text{ partition of } [s,t] \text{ and } (t'_j) \text{ partition of } [u,v] \right\}.$$

□

Remark 3. *In many cases, $z \mapsto V_\rho(R_K;[s-z,t-z]\times[s,t])$ attains its maximum at $z=0$. If $\mu = \delta_0$, we have $b_k = 1$ for every k and the estimate above is sharp.*

In order to use Proposition 1 to control the ρ-variation of $R(x,y)$, we need to control $\|\mu\|_{TV}$. Since $b_k = b_{-k}$ we observe

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} b_k e^{ikx} = 2\left(\frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx)\right).$$

Recall

Lemma 3. *Let $\{b_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence satisfying $b_k = b_{-k}$ and $b_k \to b \in \mathbb{R}$ for $k \to \infty$ and let $S_n(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k=-n}^{n} b_k e^{ikx}$. Assume one of the following conditions*

1. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k - b| < \infty$.
2. *there exists a non-increasing sequence A_k such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k < \infty$ and $|\Delta b_k| \le A_k$ for all $k \ge 0$.*
3. *b_k is quasi-convex, i.e.*
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|\Delta^2 b_k| < \infty.$$

Then, $B(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}(b_k - b)e^{ikx}$ locally uniformly on $(0,2\pi)$ and the right hand side is the Fourier series of B. Moreover,

$$\mu_{S_n} \rightharpoonup \mu_B + b\delta_0 =: \mu, \qquad \textit{weakly in } \mathcal{M}([0,2\pi])$$

and $b_k = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ikz}\,\mu(dz)$. Moreover, there is a numerical constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\mu\|_{TV} \le |b| + C \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k - b|, & \textit{in case (1)} \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k, & \textit{in case (2)} \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|\Delta^2 b_k|, & \textit{in case (3).} \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. **Step 1:** We first restrict to the case $b = 0$.

It is enough to prove that $B(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} b_k e^{ikx}$ exists locally uniformly and in $L^1([0,2\pi])$ with L^1-bound corresponding to (3.5).

(1): obvious.

(2): Assume that there exists a decreasing sequence A_k such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k < \infty$ and $|\Delta b_k| \le A_k$ for all $k \ge 0$. In this case the claim has been proven in [Tel73]. For completeness we include the proof.

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2 we obtain that

$$2\pi B(x) = \frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta b_k D_k(x)$$

exists locally uniformly in $(0,2\pi)$.

Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k < \infty$ we have $kA_k \to 0$. Using summation by parts twice we obtain

$$\frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k \frac{\Delta b_k}{A_k} D_k(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\Delta A_k| \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\Delta b_i}{A_i} D_i(x)\right).$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left|\frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx)\right| dx \le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta A_k \int_0^{2\pi} \left|\sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\Delta b_i}{A_i} D_i(x)\right| dx.$$

Elementary estimates prove that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each sequence $\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $|a_i| \le 1$

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i D_i(x) \right| dx \le C(k+1).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx) \right| dx \le C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\Delta A_k)(k+1) = C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k < \infty.$$

Consequently, $\frac{b_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k \cos(kx) \in L^1([0,2\pi])$ and b_i are the Fourier coefficients corresponding to B.

(3): Let now $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)|\Delta^2 b_k| < \infty$. A direct proof of this classical result can be found in [Kol23]. Here, we will prove that the assumptions in (i) are implied. We choose $A_k := \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\Delta^2 b_i|$. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\Delta^2 b_i| = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)|\Delta^2 b_k| < \infty$$

and the claim follows from (2).

Step 2: Let now $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

We split up S_n as

$$2\pi S_n(x) = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} b_k e^{ikx} = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} (b_k - b)e^{ikx} + bD_n(x).$$

By the first step we know that

$$2\pi B(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} (b_k - b)e^{ikx}$$

exists locally uniformly in $(0,2\pi)$ and in $L^1([0,2\pi])$ with bound on the L^1-norm given by (3.5). Therefore, the measures $\mu_{B_n} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k=-n}^{n}(b_k - b)e^{ikx}\, dx$ converge to μ_B in $\mathcal{M}^w([0,2\pi])$. It is well-known that $D_n(x) \to 2\pi\delta_0$ in $\mathcal{M}^w([0,2\pi])$. Thus,

$$S_n(x) \to \mu_B + b\delta_0 =: \mu, \qquad \text{in } \mathcal{M}^w([0,2\pi]).$$

The bound on the total variation norm of μ then follows from step one. □

Lemma 3 in combination with Proposition 1 allows to derive bounds on the ρ-variation of covariance functions of type (3.4) depending on μ only via its total variation norm. Since we will use this to prove uniform estimates, we will need the following uniform estimates on the L^1-norm of Fourier series.

Lemma 4. *Let $b \in C^1(0,\infty)$ with $b(r) \to 0$ for $r \to \infty$ and $b_k^\tau := b(\tau^m k)$ for some $\tau, m > 0$. If*

(1) *b is convex, non-increasing, then b_k^τ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3, (1), $B^\tau(x) = \frac{b_0^\tau}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k^\tau \cos(kx)$ exists locally uniformly in $(0,2\pi)$ and*

$$\|B^\tau\|_{L^1([0,2\pi])} \le Cb_0,$$

for some $C > 0$.

(2) *$b \in C^2(0,\infty)$ with $r|b''(r)| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, then b_k^τ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3, (2) and*

$$\|B^\tau\|_{L^1([0,2\pi])} \le C \int_0^\infty r|b''(r)|dr,$$

for some $C > 0$ with B^τ as in (1).

Proof. (1): Since b, $|b'|$ are non-increasing $\Delta b_k^\tau \le 0$ and $-\Delta b_k$ is non-increasing. We set $A_k := -\Delta b_k$. Clearly, $\sum_{k=0}^\infty A_k = 2b_0$ and the claim follows from Lemma 3.

(2): Let $b^\tau(r) := b(\tau^m r)$ and observe

$$\Delta^2 b_k^\tau = b_{k+2}^\tau - 2b_{k+1}^\tau + b_k^\tau = \int_{k+1}^{k+2} (b^\tau)'(s)ds - \int_{k+1}^{k+2} (b^\tau)'(s-1)ds = \int_{k+1}^{k+2}\int_{s-1}^{s} (b^\tau)''(r)drds.$$

Since $(b^\tau)''(r)dr = \tau^m b''(\tau^m r)d(\tau^m r)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^\infty (k+1)|\Delta^2 b_k^\tau| &\le \sum_{k=0}^\infty \int_{k+1}^{k+2}\int_{s-1}^{s} (r+1)|(b^\tau)''(r)|drds \\
&\le \sum_{k=0}^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_{k+1}^{k+2} \mathbf{1}_{[s-1,s]}(r)(r+1)|(b^\tau)''(r)|dsdr \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_1^\infty \mathbf{1}_{[r,r+1]}(s)(r+1)|(b^\tau)''(r)|dsdr \\
&\le \int_0^\infty (r+1)(r\wedge 1)|(b^\tau)''(r)|dr \\
&= \int_0^\infty \tau^m(\tau^{-m}r+1)(\tau^{-m}r\wedge 1)|b''(r)|dr \\
&= \int_0^\infty r(\tau^{-m}r\wedge 1)|b''(r)|dr + \int_0^\infty (r\wedge \tau^m)|b''(r)|dr \\
&\le 2\int_0^\infty r|b''(r)|dr.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3 this finishes the proof. ☐

Proposition 1 and Lemma 3 motivate the following partial order between bounded sequences

Definition 1. (1) *A sequence (b_k) is negligible if (b_k) satisfies condition (1) or (2) from Lemma 3.*

(2) *A family of sequences (b_k^τ) is uniformly negligible if (b_k^τ) satisfies condition (1) or (2) from Lemma 3 with uniformly bounded right hand side in* (3.5).

(3) *For two bounded sequences (a_k),(c_k) we write $(c_k) \preceq (a_k)$ if there is a negligible sequence (b_k) such that $c_k = a_k b_k$ for every k.*

The reason for this definition is that as soon as we can control the ρ-variation of $R_K(x,y) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k e^{ik(x-y)}$ and $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |a_k| < \infty$ we also have a control on the ρ-variation of $R(x,y) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} c_k e^{ik(x-y)}$ for each sequence $(c_k) \preceq (a_k)$ by Proposition 1 and Lemma 3. As an immediate Corollary we obtain

Proposition 2. *Assume that the covariance of* Ψ *is of the form*

$$R(x,y)=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}c_k e^{ik(x-y)}$$

with $c_k \preceq a_k$ *and* a_k *satisfying* $a_k = a_{-k}$, $\Delta^2(k^2 a_k)\leq 0$ *for all* $k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} k^3|\Delta^2 a_k| + k^2|\Delta a_k| + k|a_k| = 0$$

and $a_k = O\left(k^{-(1+\frac{1}{\rho})}\right)$ *for some* $\rho\geq 1$. *Then the series* $K(x)=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} a_k\cos(kx)$ *is the Fourier series of a* $\frac{1}{\rho}$*-Hölder function, the covariance* R *of the random process* $x\mapsto(\Psi^1(x),...,\Psi^d(x))$ *is of finite* ρ*-variation and there is a constant* $C>0$ *such that*

$$V_\rho(R;[x,y]^2)^\rho \leq C|y-x|,$$

holds for all $[x,y]^2\subseteq[0,2\pi]^2$. *The constant* C *depends only on* ρ, *the Hölder-norm of* K *and the right hand side of* (3.5). *If, in addition,* $\rho\in[1,2)$ *then* $x\mapsto(\Psi^1(x),...,\Psi^d(x))$ *lifts to a geometric* p*-rough path* $\mathbf{\Psi}\in C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-Hölder}([0,2\pi],G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *almost surely for every* $p>2\rho$.

Proof. We first consider the case $c_k = a_k$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and verify the assumptions in Corollary 1. By assumption $x\mapsto(\Psi^1(x),...,\Psi^d(x))$ is a centered, continuous Gaussian process with independent components. By Lemma 2 we know that

$$x\mapsto\sigma^2(x)=\mathbb{E}|\Psi^1(x)-\Psi^1(0)|^2 = 2(K(0)-K(x))$$

is concave on $[0,2\pi]$ and non-decreasing on $[0,\pi]$. Moreover, in [Lor48, Satz 8] it is shown that K is $\frac{1}{\rho}$-Hölder if and only if $a_k = O\left(k^{-(1+\frac{1}{\rho})}\right)$ and in particular $\sigma^2(x)\leq 2|K|_{\frac{1}{\rho}-\text{Höl}}|x|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$. Hence, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 yield the claim.

In the case of general sequences (b_k) Proposition 1 together with Lemma 3 imply the claim. □

4. Lifting Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes in space

Recall that we aim to construct spatial geometric rough path lifts of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes corresponding to

$$d\Psi_t^i = (-(-\Delta)^\alpha - 1)\Psi_t^i\,dt + dW_t^i \tag{4.1}$$

with periodic boundary conditions on $[0,2\pi]$. Note that $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ admits an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors in $L^2([0,2\pi])$ which up to multiplicities is given by the Fourier basis

$$e_k(x) := \begin{cases}\sin(kx), & k>0\\ \frac{1}{2}, & k=0\\ \cos(kx), & k<0.\end{cases}$$

As a natural generalization of the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\alpha$ in (4.1) we now consider the operator A on $L^2([0,2\pi])$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(A) &= \left\{x\in L^2([0,2\pi])\;\middle|\;\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\mu_k^2(x,e_k)^2<\infty\right\}\\ Ax &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\mu_k(x,e_k),\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where (μ_k) is a sequence satisfying $\mu_{-k} = \mu_k$ and $\mu_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. The case of the (fractional) Laplace operator $A = (-\Delta)^\alpha$ is recovered with the choice $\mu_k = |k|^{2\alpha}$.

We consider (possibly) colored Wiener noise W_t with covariance operator Q given by $Qe_k := \sigma_k e_k$, where σ_k is a non-negative sequence of real numbers satisfying $\sigma_k = \sigma_{-k}$. Thus, (informally) we can write

$$W_t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\sigma_k} \beta_t^k e_k,$$

for a sequence β^k of independent $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued standard Brownian motions.

We will apply Corollary 1 to construct geometric rough path lifts of the strictly stationary solution to

$$d\Psi_t^i = (-A - \lambda)\Psi_t^i dt + dW_t^i, \quad i = 1, ..., d. \tag{4.3}$$

with $\lambda > 0$. Note that e_k diagonalizes $A + \lambda$ with eigenvalues

$$\lambda_k = \mu_k + \lambda > 0.$$

Assume from now on

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k} < \infty. \tag{4.4}$$

Then there is a unique strictly stationary mild solution Ψ to (4.3). The decomposition

$$\Psi(t, x; \omega) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_t^k(\omega) e_k(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} Z_t^k(\omega) e^{ikx} \tag{4.5}$$

leads to a decoupled, infinite system of d-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes:

$$dY_t^k = -\lambda_k Y_t^k dt + \sqrt{\sigma_k} d\beta_t^k,$$

and $Z_t^k := \frac{1}{2}\left(Y_t^{-|k|} - i\mathrm{sgn}(k) Y_t^{|k|}\right)$ with $\mathrm{sgn}(0) := 0$, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. The Y^k are independent $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Gaussian processes with stationary increments and i.i.d. components. Since $\lambda_k = \lambda_{-k}$ and $\sigma_k = \sigma_{-k}$ we have $\mathcal{L}(Y^k) = \mathcal{L}(Y^{-k})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In the following we consider a single component of Ψ and Y^k and suppress the corresponding index for simplicity of notation. Note

$$\mathbb{E} Z_t^k \overline{Z_s^l} = \mathbb{E} Y_t^k Y_s^l = e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} \frac{\sigma_k}{2\lambda_k} \delta_{k,l} \tag{4.6}$$

and thus

$$R_K(x, y) = \mathbb{E}\Psi(t, x)\Psi(t, y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k}{2\lambda_k} e^{ik(x-y)} = K(x - y)$$

with

$$K(x) = \frac{\sigma_0}{4\lambda_0} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k}{2\lambda_k} \cos(kx) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k} e^{ikx}.$$

Proposition 3. (1) *Assume that* $\left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}\right) \preceq (k^{-2\alpha})$ *for some* $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. *Then, for every* $t \geq 0$, *the spatial process* $x \mapsto \Psi_t(x)$ *is a stationary, centered Gaussian process which admits a continuous modification (which we denote by the same symbol). Moreover, the covariance* R_K *is of finite* ρ*-variation for all* $\rho \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha - 1}$ *and*

$$V_\rho(R_K; [x, y]^2) \leq C|x - y|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

holds for all $[x,y]^2 \subseteq [0,2\pi]^2$ *and for each* $t \in [0,T]$*. If* $\alpha > \frac{3}{4}$*, the process* $x \mapsto \Psi_t(x)$ *lifts to a geometric* p*-rough path* $\mathbf{\Psi}(t) \in C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-Hölder}([0,2\pi], G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *almost surely for every* $p > \frac{2}{2\alpha-1}$*.*

(2) *Assume that* (σ_k) *is bounded,* (λ_k) *is eventually non-decreasing*[4] *and that*

$$\frac{|\Delta\lambda_k|}{\lambda_k} = O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right). \tag{4.7}$$

Then there is a continuous (even Hölder continuous) modification of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Psi} : [0,T] &\to C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-Hölder}([0,2\pi], G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \\ t &\mapsto \mathbf{\Psi}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. (1): It is clear that the spatial processes are stationary, centered and Gaussian. Concerning the continuity, note that since negligible sequences are bounded, $\left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}\right) \preceq (k^{-2\alpha})$ implies that there is a constant C such that $\left|\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}\right| \leq C\left|\frac{1}{k}\right|^{2\alpha}$ holds for all k. Thus [Lor48, Satz 8] implies that K is the Fourier series of a $2\alpha-1$ Hölder continuous function. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\Psi_t(x) - \Psi_t(y)\right|^2 = 2|K(0) - K(x-y)| \lesssim |x-y|^{2\alpha-1}$$

which implies that there is a continuous modification. Hence we can apply Proposition 2 which yields the claim.

(2): We will derive the existence of a continuous modification by application of Kolmogorov's continuity theorem. Therefore, we need an estimate on a q-th moment of the distance in the $d_{\frac{1}{p}-Höl}$ metric of the rough paths $\mathbf{\Psi}(t)$, $\mathbf{\Psi}(s)$ at different times $0 \leq s < t \leq T$. Such an estimate can be obtained by applying [FV10b, Theorem 15.37]: Let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, $\tau := |t-s|$ and $X(x) := (\Psi^1(t,x), ..., \Psi^d(t,x))$, $Y(x) := (\Psi^1(s,x), ..., \Psi^d(s,x))$. We will first prove that the covariance of (X,Y) has finite Hölder dominated ρ'-variation for all $\rho' > \frac{1}{2\alpha-1}$, uniformly in τ. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} R_\tau(x,y) = \mathbb{E}X^1(x)Y^1(y) &= \mathbb{E}\Psi^1(t,x)\Psi^1(s,y) \\ &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k} e^{-\lambda_k\tau}\cos(k(x-y)) \\ &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{\sigma_k|k|^{2\alpha}}{4\lambda_k}\right)\left(|k|^{-2\varepsilon\alpha}e^{-\lambda_k\tau}\right)|k|^{-2(1-\varepsilon)\alpha}\cos(k(x-y)) \end{aligned}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. We will apply Proposition 1 multiple times. We therefore need to proof that the first two sequences are (uniformly) negligible. For the first sequence this follows from our assumptions. We will show the the Δ-criterion holds for the sequence $(|k|^{-2\varepsilon\alpha}e^{-\tau\lambda_k})$. By the mean value theorem,

$$|\Delta e^{-\tau\lambda_k}| \leq \frac{|\Delta\lambda_k|}{\lambda_k \wedge \lambda_{k+1}} \sup_{\xi>0}|\xi e^{-\xi}| \lesssim |k|^{-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\Delta(|k|^{-2\varepsilon\alpha}e^{-\tau\lambda_k})| \leq |\Delta|k|^{-2\varepsilon\alpha}| + |k|^{-2\varepsilon\alpha}|\Delta e^{-\tau\lambda_k}| \lesssim |k|^{-1-2\varepsilon\alpha}.$$

---

[4] These conditions may be relaxed in various ways. However, we decided to formulate it like that for the sake of simplicity.

Since this is summable for $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ we can apply Lemma 3 which shows that the second sequence is uniformly negligible. This implies that R_τ has finite Hölder dominated ρ' variation for $\rho' = \frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)\alpha - 1}$, uniformly in $\tau > 0$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $p > 2\rho'$ holds. Then [FV10a, Theorem 37] implies

$$\left| d_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}(t), \mathbf{\Psi}(s)) \right|_{L^q} \leq C\sqrt{q} |R_{\Psi(t)-\Psi(s)}|_\infty^\theta,$$

for some $\theta = \theta(p, \rho') > 0$ and all $q \in [1, \infty)$. In order to estimate the right hand side we note

$$\begin{aligned} |R_{\Psi^1(t)-\Psi^1(s)}(x,y)| &= |\mathbb{E}\Psi^1(t,x)\Psi^1(t,y) - \Psi^1(t,x)\Psi^1(s,y) \\ &\quad - \Psi^1(t,y)\Psi^1(s,x) + \Psi^1(s,x)\Psi^1(s,y)| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k}{2\lambda_k} \left(1 - e^{-\lambda_k \tau}\right) e^{ik(x-y)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k} \left|1 - e^{-\lambda_k \tau}\right| \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \leq N} \sigma_k |t-s| + C N^{1-2\alpha'} \sum_{k > N} \frac{k^{2\alpha'-1}\sigma_k}{\lambda_k} \\ &\leq C(N|t-s| + N^{1-2\alpha'}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha' \in (1/2, \alpha)$. We then choose $N \sim |t-s|^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha'}}$ to obtain

$$|R_{\Psi^1(t)-\Psi^1(s)}(x,y)| \leq C|t-s|^{1-\frac{1}{2\alpha'}},$$

and thus

$$\left| d_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}(t), \mathbf{\Psi}(s)) \right|_{L^q} \leq C\sqrt{q} |t-s|^{\theta(1-\frac{1}{2\alpha'})},$$

for some $\theta > 0$ and all $p > \frac{2}{2\alpha - 1}$, $q \in [1, \infty)$. Now Kolmogorovs continuity theorem implies that for a small $\gamma > 0$ there is a modification of $t \mapsto \mathbf{\Psi}(t)$ (again denoted by $\mathbf{\Psi}(t)$) such that

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{\Psi}\|_{\gamma-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C < \infty,$$

for some constant $C = C(\gamma, T, \rho, \theta, q)$. □

Example 1. *We consider the stochastic fractional heat equation with (possibly) colored noise on the one-dimensional torus, i.e.*

$$d\Psi_t^i = (-A^\alpha \Psi_t^i - \lambda)\, dt + dA^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} W_t^i, \quad i = 1, ..., d, \tag{4.9}$$

where $A^\alpha = (-\Delta)^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\gamma \geq 0$, $\lambda > 0$ and W_t is a cylindrical Wiener process. Hence, $\lambda_k = |k|^{2\alpha} + \lambda$ and $\sigma_k = |k|^{-2\gamma}$. We claim that $\left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}\right) \preceq (k^{-(2\gamma+2\alpha)})$. To see this, we need to show that $\left(\frac{|k|^{2\alpha}}{\lambda + |k|^{2\alpha}}\right)$ is negligible. Set $g(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda x + 1}$. By the mean value theorem,

$$\left| \Delta \left(\frac{|k|^{2\alpha}}{\lambda + |k|^{2\alpha}} \right) \right| \leq |g'|_\infty \left| |k+1|^{-2\alpha} - |k|^{-2\alpha} \right| \lesssim |k|^{-2\alpha - 1}.$$

Since this is summable the claim is shown for $\alpha > 0$. Therefore, the assumptions of Proposition 3 (1) are satisfied if $2\gamma + 2\alpha > \frac{3}{2}$. Clearly,

$$\frac{|\Delta\lambda_k|}{\lambda_k} = \frac{|\Delta|k|^{2\alpha}|}{|k|^{2\alpha}+\lambda} \sim |k|^{2\alpha-1}|k|^{-2\alpha} \sim |k|^{-1},$$

and (4.7) holds. Thus, there is a geometric p-rough path ($\frac{1}{p}$-Hölder continuous) $\mathbf{\Psi}_t$, lifting the strictly stationary solution Ψ_t to (4.9) in space for every $p > \frac{2}{2\gamma+2\alpha-1}$ and $t \geq 0$. Moreover, there is a continuous modification of the map

$$\mathbf{\Psi} : [0,T] \to C_0^{0,\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}lder}([0,2\pi], G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

4.1. **Stability and approximations.** In this section we will consider hyper-viscosity approximations and Galerkin approximations to Ψ and prove the strong convergence of the corresponding rough paths lifts.

The hyper-viscosity approximation $\Psi^\varepsilon = (\Psi^{\varepsilon,1}, \dots, \Psi^{\varepsilon,d})$ is the solution to

$$d\Psi_t^{\varepsilon,i} = (-A - \varepsilon A^\beta - \lambda)\Psi_t^{\varepsilon,i}dt + dW_t^i, \quad i = 1,...,d, \tag{4.10}$$

for some (large) $\beta \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. The Ψ^ε are called (hyper-)viscosity approximations of Ψ. As before, e_k diagonalizes $(A + \varepsilon A^\beta + \lambda)$ with eigenvalues

$$\lambda_k^\varepsilon = \mu_k + \varepsilon\mu_k^\beta + \lambda > 0.$$

The covariance R^ε of every component of $\Psi^\varepsilon(t)$ is given by $R^\varepsilon(x,y) = K^\varepsilon(|x-y|)$ where

$$K^\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_k \cos(kx)}{4\lambda_k^\varepsilon}.$$

The Galerkin approximation Ψ_t^N of Ψ_t is defined to be the projection of Ψ onto the $(2N+1)$-dimensional subspace spanned by $\{e_k\}_{|k|\leq N}$. This process solves the SPDE

$$d\Psi_t^{N,i} = (-P_N A - \lambda)\Psi_t^{N,i}dt + dP_N W_t^i, \quad i = 1,...,d \tag{4.11}$$

where $P_N A$ has the eigenvalues $\mu_k \mathbb{1}_{|k|\leq N}$ and $P_N W_t$ has the covariance operator Q^N given by $Q^N e_k = \mathbb{1}_{|k|\leq N}\sigma_k e_k$. The covariance R^N of $\Psi^{N,i}(t)$ is of the form $R^N(x,y) = K^N(|x-y|)$ where

$$K^N(x) = \sum_{|k|\leq N} \frac{\sigma_k \cos(kx)}{4\lambda_k}.$$

One easily checks that we can lift the spatial sample paths of Ψ_t^ε and Ψ_t^N to Gaussian rough paths and find continuous modifications of $t \mapsto \mathbf{\Psi}_t^\varepsilon$ resp. $t \mapsto \mathbf{\Psi}_t^N$. Moreover, we can prove the following strong convergence result:

Proposition 4. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 3, for every $\rho > \frac{1}{2\alpha-1}$ there are constants C_1, C_2 such that*

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} V_\rho(R_{(\Psi_t,\Psi_t^\varepsilon)};[x,y]^2) \leq C_1|x-y|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \quad \textit{and} \quad \sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} V_\rho(R_{(\Psi_t,\Psi_t^N)};[x,y]^2) \leq C_2|x-y|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \tag{4.12}$$

holds for every square $[x,y]^2 \subseteq [0,2\pi]^2$ and $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover, for every $p > \frac{2}{2\alpha-1}$, $q > 0$ and $t \in [0,T]$, one has

$$\left|d_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}_t, \mathbf{\Psi}_t^\varepsilon)\right|_{L^q(\mathbb{P})} \to 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \left|d_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}_t, \mathbf{\Psi}_t^N)\right|_{L^q(\mathbb{P})} \to 0, \tag{4.13}$$

for $\varepsilon \to 0$ resp. $N \to \infty$.

Proof. Hyper-viscosity approximation: To prove (4.12), we have to show that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} V_\rho(R^\varepsilon;[x,y]^2) \lesssim |x-y|^{1/\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\varepsilon>0} V_\rho(f^\varepsilon;[x,y]^2) \lesssim |x-y|^{1/\rho} \tag{4.14}$$

holds for every $[x,y]^2$ where $f^\varepsilon(x,y) = \mathbb{E}\left(\Psi^i_t(x)\Psi^{\varepsilon,i}_t(y)\right)$. In order to get a control on the ρ-variation of R^ε we apply Proposition 1 and Lemma 3 multiple times. To do so, we need to decompose the coefficients $\frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda^\varepsilon_k}$ as a product of a well-controlled sequence (a_k) and possibly multiple negligible sequences. For simplicity of notation we write $\lambda_k := \lambda^0_k$. We note

$$\frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda^\varepsilon_k} = |k|^{-2(1-\delta)\alpha}\left(|k|^{2\alpha}\frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k}\right)\left(|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right).$$

We need to show that the second and the third sequence are uniformly negligible. For the second sequence, this follows by our assumptions. Note that $\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k} = \left(1+\varepsilon\frac{\mu^\beta_k}{\lambda_k}\right)^{-1}$ and by the mean value theorem,

$$\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right)\right| \leq \sup_{\xi>0}\left\{\frac{\xi}{(1+\xi)^2}\right\}\frac{\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\mu^\beta_k}{\lambda_k}\right)\right|}{\frac{\mu^\beta_k}{\lambda_k}\wedge\frac{\mu^\beta_{k+1}}{\lambda_{k+1}}} \sim \mu_k^{1-\beta}\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\mu^\beta_k}{\lambda_k}\right)\right|.$$

Furthermore,

$$|\Delta\lambda_k^{-1}| \leq \frac{|\Delta\lambda_k|}{\lambda_k^2} \leq \frac{|\Delta\mu_k|}{\mu_k^2}$$

and thus

$$\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\mu^\beta_k}{\lambda_k}\right)\right| \leq \mu^\beta_k|\Delta\lambda_k^{-1}| + \lambda^{-1}_{k+1}|\Delta\mu^\beta_k| \lesssim \mu_k^{\beta-2}|\Delta\mu_k| + \mu_k^{-1}|\Delta\mu^\beta_k|,$$

which shows that

$$\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right)\right| \lesssim \frac{|\Delta\mu_k|}{\mu_k} + \frac{|\Delta\mu^\beta_k|}{\mu^\beta_k} \sim \frac{|\Delta\lambda_k|}{\lambda_k} = O(k^{-1}),$$

uniformly in ε. Since $\left|\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right| \leq 1$,

$$\left|\Delta\left(|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right)\right| \leq |\Delta|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}| + |k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\left|\Delta\left(\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right)\right| = O(k^{-1-2\delta\alpha}),$$

which shows that for every $\delta>0$, $\left(|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\right)$ is uniformly negligible. For any $\rho > \frac{1}{2\alpha-1}$, we can choose $\delta>0$ small enough such that $\rho = \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)\alpha-1}$ holds. This shows the left hand side of (4.14). For $\Psi^i_t(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} Y^k_t e_k(x)$ and $\Psi^{\varepsilon,i}_t(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} Y^{k,\varepsilon}_t e_k(x)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}Y^k_tY^{l,\varepsilon}_t &= \mathbb{E}\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda_k s}\sqrt{\sigma_k}\,d\beta^k_s\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda^\varepsilon_l s}\sqrt{\sigma_l}\,d\beta^l_s\\ &= \sigma_k\int_0^\infty e^{-(\lambda_k+\lambda^\varepsilon_k)s}\,ds\,\delta_{k,l} = \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k+\lambda^\varepsilon_k}\,\delta_{k,l}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\varepsilon}(x,y) &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e_k(x)e_k(y)\mathbb{E}Y_t^k Y_t^{k,\varepsilon} \\ &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e_k(x)e_k(y)\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k+\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}} \\ &= \frac{\sigma_0}{2(\lambda_0+\lambda_0^{\varepsilon})} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k+\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}}\cos(k(x-y)). \end{aligned}$$

We decompose the coefficients as follows:

$$\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_k+\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}} = |k|^{-2(1-\delta)\alpha}\left(|k|^{2\alpha}\frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}\right)\left(|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\frac{\lambda_k}{2\lambda_k+\varepsilon\mu_k^{\beta}}\right)$$

for $\delta > 0$. Noting that $\frac{\lambda_k}{2\lambda_k+\varepsilon\mu_k^{\beta}} = \left(2+\varepsilon\frac{\mu_k^{\beta}}{\lambda_k}\right)^{-1}$, we can proceed as above to see that also the right hand side of (4.14) holds and thus (4.12) is shown in the hyper-viscosity case. It remains to prove (4.13). Using [FV10a, Theorem 37] and the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{x\in[0,2\pi]} \mathbb{E}|\Psi_t(x)-\Psi_t^{\varepsilon}(x)|^2 \to 0 \tag{4.15}$$

for $\varepsilon \to 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\Psi(x,t)-\Psi^{\varepsilon}(x,t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|\Psi(x,t)|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\Psi^{\varepsilon}(x,t)|^2 - 2\mathbb{E}\Psi(x,t)\Psi^{\varepsilon}(x,t) \\ &= \sum_k \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k} + \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}} - \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k+\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\left|\frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k} + \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}} - \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k+\lambda_k^{\varepsilon}}\right| \le \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k} + \frac{\sigma_k}{4\lambda_k+4\varepsilon\mu_k^{\beta}} + \frac{\sigma_k}{2\lambda_k+\varepsilon\mu_k^{\beta}} \le \frac{\sigma_k}{\lambda_k}$$

and since this is summable, we can use dominated convergence to see that indeed (4.15) holds for $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Galerkin approximation: Again we have to prove that

$$\sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} V_\rho(R^N;[x,y]^2) \lesssim |x-y|^{1/\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} V_\rho(f^N;[x,y]^2) \lesssim |x-y|^{1/\rho} \tag{4.16}$$

holds where $f^N(x,y) = \mathbb{E}\Psi_t^{N,i}(x)\Psi_t^i(y)$. Note that

$$K^N(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |k|^{-2(1-\delta)\alpha}\left(|k|^{2\alpha}\frac{\sigma_k}{4\mu_k}\right)(|k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\mathbb{1}_{|k|\le N})\cos(kx).$$

The second sequence is negligible by assumption. Using Proposition 1, it suffices to show that the Fourier series

$$B^N = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |k|^{-2\delta\alpha}\mathbb{1}_{|k|\le N}e_k = \sum_{|k|\le N} |k|^{-2\delta\alpha}e_k$$

is uniformly bounded in $L^1([0,2\pi])$. Since $\Delta k^{-2\delta\alpha} = O(k^{-2\delta\alpha-1})$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty}\log(k)k^{-2\delta\alpha} = 0$ we can apply the Sidon-Teljakovskiĭ Theorem (cf. [Tel73, Theorem 4]) to obtain $B^N \to B$ for

$N \to \infty$ in $L^1([0,2\pi])$. This proves the left hand side of (4.16). If $\Psi_t^{N,i}(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{Y}_t^k e_k(x)$ with $\tilde{Y}_t^k = \mathbb{1}_{|k|\le N} Y_t^k$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} f^N(x,y) &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e_k(x)e_k(y)\mathbb{E}Y_t^k\tilde{Y}_t^k = \sum_{|k|\le N} e_k(x)e_k(y)\mathbb{E}|Y_t^k|^2 = \sum_{|k|\le N} \cos(k(x-y))\frac{\sigma_k}{4\mu_k} \\ &= K^N(x-y). \end{aligned}$$

With the first part, this implies (4.16) and thus (4.12) in the case of the Galerkin approximations. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}|\Psi(x,t) - \Psi^N(x,t)|^2 = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sigma_K}{4\mu_k} + \sum_{|k|\le N} \frac{\sigma_K}{4\mu_k} - 2\sum_{|k|\le N} \frac{\sigma_K}{4\mu_k} = \sum_{|k|>N} \frac{\sigma_k}{4\mu_k} \to 0$$

for $N \to \infty$ due to summability.

□

Remark 4. *One can check, using Lemma 4, that in the special case $\mu_k = |k|^\zeta$ we have*

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} V_\rho(R_{(\Psi_t,\Psi_t^\varepsilon)}; [x,y]^2) \le C_1|x-y|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

even for $\rho = \frac{1}{2\alpha-1}$ for all squares $[x,y]^2 \subseteq [0,2\pi]^2$.

Remark 5. *The bounds obtained in* (4.12) *can also be used for other purposes. For instance, they become crucial when proving uniform (exponential) integrability of certain related stochastic integrals, a question raised in* [Hai11]. *See* [FR12b] *for further details.*

Remark 6. *Our calculations are well suited to determine also the rate of convergence in* (4.13) *for the inhomogeneous rough paths metric $\varrho_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\cdot,\cdot)$ (cf.* [FV10b] *for the formal definition of these metrics). As an example, we consider the Galerkin approximations. Since*

$$\sum_{|k|>N} \frac{\sigma_k}{2\mu_k} \lesssim \sum_{|k|>N} \frac{1}{|k|^{2\alpha}} \sim \int_N^\infty x^{-2\alpha}\,dx,$$

we have $\mathbb{E}|\Psi(x,t) - \Psi^N(x,t)|^2 \to 0$ for $N \to \infty$ with rate $2\alpha - 1$. Using the results of [FR12a] *(see also* [RX12]*), for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $p = p_{\rho,\varepsilon} > 2\rho$ such that*

$$\left| \varrho_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}_t, \mathbf{\Psi}_t^N) \right|_{L^q(\mathbb{P})} \lesssim q^{\frac{1}{2}\lfloor\frac{1}{p}\rfloor} \sup_{x\in[0,2\pi]} \left(\mathbb{E}|\Psi(x,t) - \Psi^N(x,t)|^2\right)^{1-\frac{\rho}{2}-\varepsilon}.$$

Hence for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose ρ close enough to $\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}$ to see that

$$\left| \varrho_{\frac{1}{p}-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{\Psi}_t, \mathbf{\Psi}_t^N) \right|_{L^q(\mathbb{P})} \to 0,$$

for $N \to \infty$ with rate $2\alpha - \frac{3}{2} - \varepsilon$. Using a Borell-Cantelli argument, we also obtain almost sure convergence with the same rate. Note that in general, one has to choose p large in order to obtain the optimal convergence rate (cf. [FR12a] *for the optimal choice of p).*

4.2. **The continuous case.** Consider the stationary solution of

$$d\Psi_t = -((-\Delta)^\alpha + \lambda)\Psi_t \, dt + dW_t, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R},$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,1]$, $\lambda > 0$. The stationary solution can be written down explicitly (cf. [Wal86]), namely

$$\Psi_t(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_{t-s}(x,y) \, W(ds,dy),$$

where K is the fractional heat kernel operator associated to $-((-\Delta)^\alpha + \lambda)$ with Fourier transform given by

$$\hat{K}_t(\xi) = e^{-t|\xi|^{2\alpha} - \lambda t}.$$

After some calculations, one sees that the covariance R of the spatial process $x \mapsto \Psi_t(x)$ for every time point t is given by $R(x,y) = K(x-y)$ where

$$K(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\xi) e^{-ix\xi} \, d\xi$$

and

$$f(\xi) = \frac{1}{2|\xi|^{2\alpha} + 2\lambda}.$$

In order to deduce the existence of a rough path lift of $x \mapsto \Psi_t(x)$ on compact intervals of $\mathbb{R}$ by means of Theorem 1 we have to prove convexity of K, which will follow from Lemma 5 below if $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$. It is easy to see that $\sigma^2(x) = \mathbb{E}(\Psi_t(x) - \Psi_t(0))^2 \lesssim |x|^{2\alpha - 1}$. Hence, we can apply Corollary 1 to see that Ψ_t can be lifted, for every fixed time point t, to a process $\mathbf{\Psi}_t$ with sample paths in $C_0^{0,\beta-\text{Hölder}}(I, G^{[1/\beta]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, every $\beta < \alpha - 1/2$, provided $\alpha > 3/4$, where I can be an arbitrary compact interval in $\mathbb{R}$ containing 0.

It remains to establish a continuous version of the statement in Lemma 2, which provides a convexity criterion for K, i.e. a criterion for the convexity of Fourier transforms. For a function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ we define

$$\hat{f}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\xi) e^{-ix\xi} \, d\xi.$$

Then the following Lemma holds:

Lemma 5. *Assume that $\hat{f}, f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $f(\xi) = f(-\xi)$ for all ξ, f is twice differentiable almost everywhere,*

$$\lim_{\xi \to \infty} \xi^3 |f''(\xi)| + \xi^2 |f'(\xi)| + \xi |f(\xi)| = 0$$

and that there is an $x_0 \in (0, \infty]$ such that

$$\limsup_{R \to \infty} \int_0^R \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} (f(\xi)\, \xi^2) F_\xi(x) \, d\xi \le 0,$$

for all $x \in (0, x_0)$ where $F_\xi(x) = \frac{1 - \cos(\xi x)}{x^2}$ denotes the Féjer kernel. Then $\hat{f}$ is a convex function on $[0, x_0)$.

Proof. Since the proof is very similar to Lemma 2 we just sketch it briefly. By Féjer's Theorem for Fourier transforms (cf. [Kör89, Theorem 49.3]),

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-R}^{R}\left(1-\frac{|\xi|}{R}\right)\hat{g}(\xi)e^{ix\xi}\,d\xi=g(x),$$

for all x provided $g\in C\cap L^1$. Setting $g=\hat{f}$, we obtain from Fourier inversion

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\int_{-R}^{R}\left(1-\frac{|\xi|}{R}\right)f(\xi)e^{ix\xi}\,d\xi=\hat{f}(x).$$

We then proceed as in the proof of Lemma 2. □

Note that given $f\in L^1$ it does not follow in general that also $\hat{f}\in L^1$. However, Bernstein's Theorem states that the Fourier transform of functions f in the Sobolev space H^s is contained in L^1 for all $s>\frac{1}{2}$ (cf. [Hör83, Corollary 7.9.4]).

Appendix A. Notation

Let (E,d) be a metric space and $X\in C([0,1],E)$. We define the α-Hölder-seminorm by

$$\|X\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}:=\sup_{0\le s<t\le 1}\frac{d\left(X_s,X_t\right)}{|t-s|^{\alpha}}.$$

Given a positive integer N the truncated tensor algebra of degree N is given by the direct sum

$$T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)=\mathbb{R}\oplus\mathbb{R}^d\oplus\ldots\oplus\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)^{\otimes N}.$$

With tensor product $\otimes$, vector addition and usual scalar multiplication, $T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)=\left(T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right),\otimes,+,.\right)$ is an algebra. Let π_i denote the canonical projection from $T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ onto $\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)^{\otimes i}$.

For a function $X:[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}^d$ of bounded variation, we define the canonical lift $\mathbf{X}\equiv S_N(X):[0,1]\to T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ via iterated (Young) integration,

$$\mathbf{X}_t\equiv S_N(X)_t=1+\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{0<s_1<\ldots<s_i<t}dX_{s_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes dX_{s_i}$$

noting that $\mathbf{X}_0=1+0+\ldots+0=:e$ is the neutral element for $\otimes$, and that $\mathbf{X}_t$ really takes values in

$$G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)=\left\{g\in T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right):\exists X\in C^{1\text{-var}}\left([0,1],\mathbb{R}^d\right):\ g=S_N(X)_1\right\},$$

a submanifold of $T^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, called the free step-$N$ nilpotent Lie group with d generators. We will use the canonical notion of increments expressed by

$$\mathbf{X}_{s,t}:=\mathbf{X}_s^{-1}\otimes\mathbf{X}_t.$$

The dilation operator $\delta:\mathbb{R}\times G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\to G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ is defined by

$$\pi_i\left(\delta_\lambda(g)\right)=\lambda^i\pi_i(g),\ \ i=0,\ldots,N.$$

The Carnot-Caratheodory norm, given by

$$\|g\|=\inf\left\{\text{length}(X):X\in C^{1\text{-var}}\left([0,1],\mathbb{R}^d\right),S_N(X)_1=g\right\}$$

defines a continuous norm on $G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, homogeneous with respect to δ. This norm induces a (left-invariant) metric on $G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ known as Carnot-Caratheodory metric,

$$d(g,h):=\left\|g^{-1}\otimes h\right\|.$$

Let $X,Y \in C_0\left([0,1],G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\right)$, the space of continuous $G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$-valued paths started at the neutral element. We define the α-Hölder-distance by

$$d_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y}\right) \quad := \quad \sup_{0\leq s<t\leq 1} \frac{d\left(\mathbf{X}_{s,t},\mathbf{Y}_{s,t}\right)}{\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha}}.$$

Note that $d_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\mathbf{X},0\right) = \left\|\mathbf{X}\right\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}$ where 0 denotes the constant path equal to the neutral element. The following path spaces will be needed

(i) $C_0^{1/p-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\left[0,1\right],G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\right)$: the set of continuous functions $\mathbf{X}$ from $[0,1]$ into $G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ such that $d_{1/p-H\ddot{o}l}\left(0,\mathbf{X}\right)<\infty$ and $\mathbf{X}_0=e$.

(ii) $C_0^{0,1/p-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\left[0,1\right],G^N\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\right)$: the $d_{1/p-H\ddot{o}l}$-closure of

$$\left\{S_N\left(X\right),X:\left[0,1\right]\to\mathbb{R}^d \text{ smooth}\right\}.$$

Recall that a geometric p-rough path is an element of $C_0^{0,1/p-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\left[0,1\right],G^{[p]}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\right)$ and a weak geometric rough path is an element of $C_0^{1/p-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\left[0,1\right],G^{[p]}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)\right)$. For more details we refer to [FV10b, LQ02, Lyo98].

Let $T>0$ and $\Delta_T=\left\{(s,t):0\leq s\leq t\leq T\right\}$. We regard $\left((a,b),(c,d)\right)\in\Delta_T\times\Delta_T$ as a (closed) rectangle $A\subset\left[0,T\right]^2$;

$$A:=\left(\begin{array}{c} a,b \\ c,d \end{array}\right):=\left[a,b\right]\times\left[c,d\right];$$

if $a=b$ or $c=d$ we call A degenerate. Two rectangles are called essentially disjoint if their intersection is empty or degenerate. A partition Π of a rectangle $R\subset\left[0,T\right]^2$ is a finite set of essentially disjoint rectangles, whose union is R; the family of all such partitions is denoted by $\mathcal{P}\left(R\right)$. Recall that rectangular increments of a function $f:\left[0,T\right]^2\to\mathbb{R}$ are defined in terms of f evaluated at the four corner points of A,

$$f\left(A\right):=f\left(\begin{array}{c} a,b \\ c,d \end{array}\right):=f\left(\begin{array}{c} b \\ d \end{array}\right)-f\left(\begin{array}{c} a \\ d \end{array}\right)-f\left(\begin{array}{c} b \\ c \end{array}\right)+f\left(\begin{array}{c} a \\ c \end{array}\right).$$

Let us also say that a dissection D of an interval $[a,b]\subset[0,T]$ is of the form

$$D=\left(a=t_0\leq t_1\leq\cdots\leq t_n=b\right)$$

and write $\mathcal{D}\left([a,b]\right)$ for the family of all such dissections.

Definition 2. *Let $p\in[1,\infty)$. A function $f:\left[0,T\right]^2\to\mathbb{R}$ has finite p-variation if*

$$V_p\left(f;[s,t]\times[u,v]\right):=\left(\sup_{\substack{D=(t_i)\in\mathcal{D}([s,t])\\ D'=\left(t'_j\right)\in\mathcal{D}([u,v])}}\sum_{i,j}\left|f\left(\begin{array}{c} t_i,t_{i+1} \\ t'_j,t'_{j+1} \end{array}\right)\right|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}<\infty;$$

it has finite controlled p-variation if

$$\left|f\right|_{p\text{-}var;[s,t]\times[u,v]}:=\sup_{\Pi\in\mathcal{P}([s,t]\times[u,v])}\left(\sum_{A\in\Pi}\left|f\left(A\right)\right|^p\right)^{1/p}<\infty.$$

If in addition $\left|f\right|^p_{p\text{-}var;[s,t]^2}\leq C|t-s|$ we say that f has finite Hölder controlled p-variation.

For more details on higher dimensional p-variations we refer to [FV11, FV10b].

References

[CLL11] Thomas Cass, Christian Litterer, and Terry J. Lyons, *Rough paths on manifolds*, arXiv:1102.0998 (2011), 1–61.

[CQ02] Laure Coutin and Zhongmin Qian, *Stochastic analysis, rough path analysis and fractional Brownian motions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **122** (2002), no. 1, 108–140.

[FR12a] Peter K. Friz and Sebastian Riedel, *Convergence rates for the full Gaussian rough paths*, To appear in Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. (2012), 1–45.

[FR12b] ———, *Integrability of (non-)linear rough differential equations and integrals*, To appear in Stochastic Analysis and Applications (2012), 1–20.

[FV10a] Peter K. Friz and Nicolas B. Victoir, *Differential equations driven by Gaussian signals*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **46** (2010), no. 2, 369–413.

[FV10b] ———, *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 120, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010, Theory and applications.

[FV11] ———, *A note on higher dimensional p-variation*, Electron. J. Probab. **16** (2011), no. 68, 1880–1899.

[GIP12] Massimiliano Gubinelli, Peter Imkeller, and Nicolas Perkowski, *Paraproducts, rough paths and controlled distributions*, arXiv:1210.2684 (2012), 1–30.

[Hai11] Martin Hairer, *Rough stochastic PDEs*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **64** (2011), no. 11, 1547–1585.

[Hai12] ———, *Solving the KPZ equation*, arXiv preprint (2012), 1–102.

[HMW12] Martin Hairer, Jan Maas, and Hendrik Weber, *Approximating rough stochastic pdes*, arXiv:1202.3094 (2012), 1–75.

[Hör83] Lars Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. I*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 256, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, Distribution theory and Fourier analysis.

[HSV07] M. Hairer, A. M. Stuart, and J. Voss, *Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. II. The nonlinear case*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **17** (2007), no. 5-6, 1657–1706.

[HSVW05] Martin Hairer, Andrew M. Stuart, Jochen Voss, and Petter Wiberg, *Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. I. The Gaussian case*, Commun. Math. Sci. **3** (2005), no. 4, 587–603.

[HW11] Martin Hairer and Hendrik Weber, *Rough Burgers-like equations with multiplicative noise*, to appear in Probab. Theory Related Fields (2011), 1–56.

[Kat03] Eytan Katzav, *Growing surfaces with anomalous diffusion: Results for the fractal Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation*, Phys. Rev. E **68** (2003), 031607.

[Kol23] Andrei N. Kolmogorow, *Sur l'ordre de grandeur des coefficient de la série de fourier-lebesque*, Bull. Acad. Polon., Ser. A (1923), 83–86.

[Kör89] Thomas W. Körner, *Fourier analysis*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[Kra11] Xhevat Z. Krasniqi, *On the second derivative of the sums of trigonometric series*, Annals of the University of Craiova - Mathematics and Computer Science Series **38** (2011), no. 4, 76–86.

[Lor48] George G. Lorentz, *Fourier-Koeffizienten und Funktionenklassen*, Math. Z. **51** (1948), 135–149. MR 0025601 (10,33e)

[LQ02] Terry J. Lyons and Zhongmin Qian, *System control and rough paths*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002, Oxford Science Publications.

[Lyo98] Terry J. Lyons, *Differential equations driven by rough signals*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **14** (1998), no. 2, 215–310.

[MN02] Sílvia Moret and David Nualart, *Onsager-Machlup functional for the fractional Brownian motion*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **124** (2002), no. 2, 227–260.

[MR06] Michael B. Marcus and Jay Rosen, *Markov processes, Gaussian processes, and local times*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 100, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[MW97] J.Ãdin Mann and Wojbor A. Woyczynski, *Rough surfaces generated by nonlinear transport, invited paper*, Symposium on Non-linear Diffusion, TMS International Meeting, Indianapolis, 1997.

[RX12] Sebastian Riedel and Weijun Xu, *A simple proof of distance bounds for Gaussian rough paths*, arXiv:1206.5866 (2012), 1–20.

[Tel73] S. A. Teljakovskiĭ, *A certain sufficient condition of Sidon for the integrability of trigonometric series*, Mat. Zametki **14** (1973), 317–328.

[Wal86] John B. Walsh, *An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations*, École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour,XIV—1984, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1180, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 265–439.

[XTHX12] Hui Xia, Gang Tang, Dapeng Hao, and Zhipeng Xun, *Dynamics of surface roughening in the space-fractional kardarparisizhang growth: numerical results*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45** (2012), no. 29, 295001.

[Zyg59] Antoni Zygmund, *Trigonometric series. 2nd ed. Vols. I, II*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1959.

Peter K. Friz, Technische Universität Berlin, Weierstrass Institute Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: `friz@math.tu-berlin.de`

Benjamin Gess, Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: `gess@math.tu-berlin.de`

Archil Gulisashvili, Ohio University, USA
E-mail address: `gulisash@ohio.edu`

Sebastian Riedel, Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: `riedel@math.tu-berlin.de`